

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15 (legislative day of January 9), 1923.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be rear admirals.

Charles B. McVay, jr.
John H. Dayton.

To be captain.

Kenneth G. Castleman.

To be commanders.

Grafton A. Beall, jr.	Bruce R. Ware, jr.
William H. Lee.	Arie A. Corwin.
Ralph C. Needham.	George M. Courts.
George W. Kenyon.	

To be lieutenant commanders.

Robert B. Simons.	Horatio J. Peirce.
Louis P. Wenzell.	Hugh C. Frazer.
Ellis M. Zacharias.	Thales S. Boyd.
Harold B. Grow.	James A. Crutchfield.
Beriah M. Thompson.	

To be lieutenants.

Otto H. H. Strack.	Merritt P. Higgins.
Carl H. Forth.	Carl A. Scott.
Duane L. Taylor.	William L. Peterson.
Hubert H. Anderson.	Paul C. Warner.
Alfred P. Moran, jr.	Raymond F. Tyler.
Paul F. Lee.	Troy N. Thweatt.
Ralph E. Jennings.	Harry F. Carlson.
Frank N. Sayre.	Frederick O. Goldsmith.
Earle H. Kincaid.	Daniel H. Kane.
George W. Brashears, jr.	Russell V. Pollard.
Fred A. Hardesty.	Thomas D. Guinn.
William Hartenstein.	

To be lieutenants (junior grade).

Harry E. Stevens.	Myron T. Richardson.
Walter M. Shipley.	John A. Sedgwick.
Clyde Keene.	Jackson R. Tate.
Daniel F. Mulvihill.	Lawrence F. Blodgett.
David McWhorter, jr.	James S. Haughey.
Samuel E. Lee.	Merritt A. Bittinger.
Clarence E. Williams.	Cyril E. Taylor.
Alvin Henderson.	William L. Hickey.
Grover C. Watkins.	Bernard J. Loughman.
Thomas P. Kane.	Raymond C. Ferris.
Wiley B. Jones.	William H. Galbraith.
Harley E. Barrows.	Robert D. Threshie.
Philip D. Butler.	Ernest E. Stevens.
Donald B. McClary.	Frank W. Schmidt.
Alva Henderson.	Maurice Van Cleave.
Ell B. Parsons.	Edward H. McMenemy.
Elmer J. Tiernan.	Royal A. Houghton.
Julius C. Kinsky.	Darrough S. Gurney.
Benjamin S. Brown.	Carroll T. Bonney.
Francis E. Matthews.	John B. Mallard.
Charles R. Hoffercker.	George D. Morrison.
Henry L. Burmann.	William E. Miller.
Eugene Bastian.	William P. Hepburn.
Howard L. Clark.	Jim T. Acree.
Frederick A. Smith.	Charles L. Surran.
Charles H. Miller.	Edward H. Doolin.
Ralph L. Lovejoy.	Marvin H. Grove.

To be medical inspector with rank of commander.

Eugene A. Vickery.

To be surgeon with rank of lieutenant commander.

Frederic L. Conklin.

To be passed assistant surgeons with rank of lieutenant.

Charles F. Behrens.	Fred M. Rohow.
Duncan D. Bullock.	Frank M. Moxon.
Charles E. Clark.	Lyle J. Millan.
Navy F. X. Banvard.	Robert E. Duncan.
Lloyd L. Edmisten.	

To be dental surgeon with rank of lieutenant commander.

Alexander G. Leyle.

To be passed assistant dental surgeons with rank of lieutenant.

Ray Endell Farnsworth.	Leonard M. Desmond.
Walter I. Minowitz.	Harold J. Hill.

To be chaplain with rank of captain.

George E. T. Stevenson.

To be naval constructor with rank of admiral.

Robert Stocker.

To be naval constructors with rank of captain.

William McEntee.	George C. Westervelt.
Richard D. Gatewood.	Emory S. Land.

To be naval constructors with rank of commander.

Walter W. Webster.
Harold E. Saunders.

POSTMASTERS.

TEXAS.

Charles A. Ziegenhals, Bastrop.

INDIANA.

Howard J. Tooley, Columbus.
Milton E. Spencer, Ossian.

IOWA.

William C. Howell, Keokuk.
Willis G. Smith, Rock Rapids.
Baty K. Bradfield, Spirit Lake.
Archle C. Smith, Storm Lake.

LOUISIANA.

Herman M. Foster, Cedar Grove.
Silvio Broussard, New Iberia.
Alexander E. Harding, Slidell.
Louis Hebert, White Castle.

MINNESOTA.

William W. Tyndall, Grand Rapids.
Charles F. Wolfe, Kellogg.
George L. Chesley, Pipestone.
James W. Featherston, Staples.

MISSOURI.

Herbert Schnur, Joplin.
Henry O. Abbott, Lebanon.
Edward B. Wilson, Stanberry.

NEW JERSEY.

Irvin D. B. Spatz, Edgewater.
George I. Harvey, Palmyra.

OHIO.

Howard M. Snedeker, Bellaire.
William C. Shafer, Struthers.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John D. Gerhart, East Greenville.
John S. Leidy, Hatboro.
Franklin H. Bean, Quakertown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 15, 1923.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose presence we wait, we thank Thee for our Republic. It is a goodly vine we have inherited; its clusters of blessings hang richly and its roots run out in many ways for the comfort of all. Help us to understand our responsibilities and to see the possibility of even a nobler patriotism. Make it easier for us to go out and be better citizens and to carry to higher usefulness the influence that we possess. O Father of wisdom and mercy, bless all philanthropies which go forward to teach the ignorant, to give bread to the hungry, and to give freedom to those who are oppressed. Be the refuge for those who are now in the waters of affliction. Keep them close to the Father's heart and may Thy sweet peace enfold their troubled souls. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 13, and the Journal of Sunday, January 14, were read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The Calendar for Unanimous Consent is in order to-day, and the Clerk will report the first bill on that calendar.

LAC DU FLAMBEAU BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWAS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 6428, a bill for the enrollment and allotment of the members of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewas, in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 31 and 36 to the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Also that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13593. An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Also that the Senate had passed Senate bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to stimulate crop production in the United States;

S. 3515. An act for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J.; and

S. 4309. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii,' approved April 30, 1900, as amended, to establish an Hawaiian Homes Commission, granting certain powers to the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1921.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13374. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13615. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7658. An act to amend the act approved August 25, 1919, entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes."

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 13194, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, this is the measure which was under consideration two weeks ago, and to which at one time objection was made because of the authority proposed to be given to a civic association in Los Angeles to receive and to the Treasury Department to coin silver 50-cent pieces of a type in commemoration of the Monroe doctrine. I must say that I am not very much in sympathy with this proposal to have cities or private establishments authorized to receive specially designed coin that might be sold at any price, to their own profit.

I would like to have the gentleman who reported the bill give some reason why we should keep on making exceptions. I am aware that last year we authorized the minting of a special coin in commemoration of some local event in Ohio. That was strongly pressed by the congressional delegation of that State. They utilized the fund raised from the sale of the dollar gold pieces to build a highway. If we keep on passing these bills every Member of the House is going to be besieged with demands from his constituents to have some special coin minted that will be for the exclusive benefit of that locality. It is a bad policy—one that is going to plague us if we keep on multiplying these instances.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Monroe doctrine can not be designated as a local affair.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is going to be a local affair, I will say to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The Monroe doctrine is not applicable to any one particular locality.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is national in its character, but they are trying to localize it by giving the privilege to this Los Angeles Association to have the exclusive control of these 50-cent pieces. They are trying to localize a national affair in which all the country is interested. Why should the Clearing House Association of Los Angeles have the exclusive privilege of these 50-cent pieces?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather have this association sell them for a sufficient bonus to finance their celebration than to have them come to Congress for several hundred thousand dollars, as they do in many other localities.

Mr. STAFFORD. Two weeks ago, when this bill was first being considered, I stated the very argument that the gentleman is now advancing, that I would rather have them obtain the funds to meet the expenses through the premium derived from the sale of these coins than to call upon Congress for an appropriation. I am surprised that the gentleman was not here at that time.

Mr. BLANTON. I was here, and some gentleman objected to the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not object to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, some one did—I think it was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]—and it went off the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated then that I would not object to the bill, and I did not object to the bill. The gentleman, the proponent of the bill, said that that was not the purpose; that it was merely the purpose to give this association the exclusive right over the 50-cent pieces.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will read the RECORD for December 18, 1922, when the bill was objected to, he will see that I then said that they would sell them for a bonus.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is mistaken; I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not say that the gentleman from Wisconsin stated that; I stated that I said it myself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, well, I am not responsible for what the gentleman said.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this is not a new precedent. Of course, it is national in its character. It is the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine. They propose in this celebration to make films and pictures of the progress of industry from the time of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine to the present time, and these pictures and films are to be given to the educational world and will go through the universities and schools of the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VESTAL. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am more concerned, and the House is more concerned, in what is going to be done with the coins. This bill does not provide for any film. What is the clearing-house association going to do with the coins?

Mr. VESTAL. Just as they did at the centennial in Plymouth and over in Ohio. The coins are sold. Of course, there must be some association to take the coins from the Government. This bill would not have been reported favorably, nor would the Treasury Department have recommended the bill, unless there had been some association to take charge of the coins.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I am getting a different view from what the author of the measure said was the purpose when the bill was last under consideration. I have no objection to the bill if the purpose is to sell these coins at a premium so as to provide for a fitting celebration in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine. If that is a fact, as I stated then, I would rather have them get the money in that way than to call on Congress for a fund. Under these circumstances, if the gentleman is quite certain that that is the purpose, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the bill the bill S. 4096, similar in every way to the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 4096, a similar Senate bill, for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.
The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine there shall be coined at the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of not more than 300,000 such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

SEC. 2. That the coins herein authorized shall be issued only upon the request of the Los Angeles Clearing House and upon payment by such clearing house to the United States of the par value of such coins.

SEC. 3. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coining, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized; *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is usually present on unanimous-consent days, but he is not the only Member who is always present. Because I indicated part of what transpired in connection with this bill on the last unanimous-consent day, which was December 18, 1922, the gentleman facetiously or otherwise intimated that I was not here, but he will find, if he will examine the Record—and in connection with my remarks I shall insert exactly what transpired concerning the bill—that I then suggested that this would be a cheaper way to finance the proposition than having some one later come to Congress for an appropriation. I state this merely to keep the record straight in that respect. This bill was objected to on December 18, 1922. I quote from page 637 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, as follows:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If they are not going to ask the Federal Government for help—which would be a departure from the usual custom—and if by section 2 they can sell these coins at a premium of 50 cents or a dollar and thereby secure funds—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, yes; I will yield to a Senator at any time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Vermont will not object, holding the views that he does.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. TREADWAY. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. VESTAL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the bill H. R. 13194, of similar title, was ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGING GRADE AND PERCENTAGES OF ENLISTED MEN, UNITED STATES ARMY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4037) to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this bill entails an additional obligation upon the Treasury amounting to a million and a half dollars. I think it is too important to consider on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to take up the time of the House in explaining this measure if, after the explanation, the bill is going to be objected to. This is an important measure, and it involves not to exceed \$1,500,000, I say frankly to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but it is a matter involving the efficiency of the tactical organization of the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps it will be agreeable to have the matter go over for two weeks?

Mr. McKENZIE. I could not consent to that, for this reason: Under the law reducing the Army to 125,000 men it became necessary to demote and eliminate a great many of the officers now holding these various positions in the various grades. That was to be effective on the 31st day of December. I do not know

whether it has been put into effect or not, but evidently it will be very soon, and in the interest of good government and efficient organization, if we are going to pass this bill at all, we ought to pass it now. If we are not going to pass it, it will be up to the Army to do the best it can without it, and I can see no good reason for asking to delay the measure.

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill, as I have the figures before me—and if I am in error I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], who reported the bill, correct me—provides for 734 more noncommissioned officers of the three higher grades than are authorized in existing law upon the basis of an Army of 280,000 men.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I do not know where he gets those figures.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was in error by saying "based on an Army of 280,000 men." I should correct that by saying of the men that were in those classes on June 30, 1922.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me see whether I am mistaken, and if I am in error I wish to be corrected. The gentleman says that this bill is important. I agree with him. I take it it is too important to be considered on Unanimous-Consent Calendar, and should not be considered under suspension of the rules, because no opportunity would be given to amend the law, and it should be amended. What are the figures as given to me by a member of the Army staff?

On June 30, 1922, in the first grade of enlisted noncommissioned officers, master sergeants they are called, there were 1,277 men; in the second grade, technical or first sergeants, 3,129 men; in the third grade, staff sergeants, 2,663 men—a total of 7,069 men. If I am in error as to those figures I wish to be corrected, because upon that I base my statement. Under this bill it is proposed to have 992 in the first grade, 2,582 in the second grade, 4,229 in the third grade, or a total of 7,803. If I am in error as to that statement, that this bill will provide more of these noncommissioned officers in these three higher grades than they had in the service on June 30 last, I wish to be corrected.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I am seeking information or a correction of any error that I may be laboring under.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The way the gentleman phrased it I thought he intended it to be an argument.

Mr. STAFFORD. I intended it to be both a question and an argument. I am appealing to the open mind of the Members of the House.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman is doing it well; he is building it up with something that they do not need to consider if they pass on the merits of the bill. That is why I want to see if we can not get an idea in here that is not contemplated in the gentleman's argument. The fact is that this bill is not based on any proposition for the tactical organization of the Army, in numbers, for field strength or operation, either the present existing force or one that may be contemplated. These men in the noncommissioned offices of higher grades, like the commissioned officers, are not grouped by numbers fitting to the tactical organization now existing in the Army but for the special work that the Army is required as a military institution to do throughout the country at large in conducting that part of the plans for national defense and popular instruction in military science not related to the mere tactical organization of any army in garrison or in the field.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am still waiting for some explanation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is the explanation.

Mr. STAFFORD. These numbers as provided in this bill would increase the three higher classes by over 700.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Those numbers do not relate to the strength of the Army. The policy is entirely different.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think I can make plain to the gentleman from Wisconsin that under the Army reorganization law we provided for certain grades in the Army and that there should be a certain percentage of noncommissioned officers in the various grades. When we passed that law we provided that the maximum enlisted strength of the Army should not exceed 280,000. The Secretary of War held that the language was not a limitation, but it was mandatory, and he began immediately to have the Army enlisted up to the full authorized strength of 280,000, which was not the intent of Congress; but the Army, in order to carry out that program, promoted into

these various grades numbers of officers far in excess of what we have at the present time or what is contemplated by this bill. Then Congress took action and provided that we should not enlist beyond 175,000 men. When that act was passed by Congress the War Department immediately ceased promoting noncommissioned officers into these various grades. Then we cut the Army to 150,000. Then we cut it down again to 125,000, in which the gentleman from Wisconsin was very largely instrumental and exercised a good deal of influence in his argument—as I say, we cut the Army to 125,000. Now, to carry out the percentages provided for in the original act we would have had perhaps a sufficient number of noncommissioned officers to handle the technical force, to take care of the ordnance depots, to take care of the flying machines and air service, to take care of the Signal Corps, and furnish the necessary noncommissioned officers of the several grades to go into the schools of the country and—

Mr. FIELDS. And for the National Guard.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; for the National Guard. But, as my colleague from Vermont said, to bring those percentages down exactly to what it would have been for the Army of 125,000 is to my mind ruinous to the Army, not only so far as the Army is concerned but to the schools where we send these young men of higher grades than the fourth. The great increase in this bill is in the third grade. As the gentleman well knows, in the first grade we have more noncommissioned officers now in this grade than this bill will provide for. This bill will require the demotion of 680 men, and in doing this I can not help but think of the Navy in comparison when we permit them to have their thousands in those grades.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why the necessity for increasing the three higher grades to nearly 750 more than what was in the service June 30 last before there became effective the limitation of 125,000 men in the Army?

Mr. McKENZIE. Those officers were in the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. In lower grades, it is true.

Mr. McKENZIE. No; in these higher grades.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not challenge the statement I made on which I predicate my argument, and I again repeat that on June 30—not July 1—1922, before the enlisted strength of 125,000 became effective, there were in the master sergeant's grade 1,277. There were in the second or technical or first sergeants' grade 3,129. There were in the third or staff sergeants' grade 2,063, or a total of 7,069. I hope my mathematics are correct. Now, you are proposing by this bill in those three grades a total number of 7,803, and I want to have some explanation of increasing this force by nearly 750.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not know where the gentleman got his figures. But there is one thing certain this bill does not increase the noncommissioned officers in the Army but is a decrease in the number.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does increase the numbers of these three higher grades.

Mr. McKENZIE. Here is where the gentleman is disturbed and confused. Under the percentage basis in the Army reorganization law it is true there would be an excess, but the fact is we commissioned these men, they have been promoted, they are now being carried as surplus and have been carried as surplus.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; that is no explanation at all. That is not the fact and the gentleman can not escape the logic of my figures furnished to me by an officer of the Army Staff that on June 30 in these three higher grades there were 7,069, and under the bill as proposed, according to the gentleman's report, there will be 7,803, or nearly 800 more men in those higher grades at much higher salaries than now being paid.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will admit to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there will be an increase in the three higher grades by adopting the percentages provided for in this bill over the old percentages, but there will not be an increase in the number of officers now in these grades.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is challenging the figures that were furnished me by an officer of the General Staff. If I am not correct in the statement I have made I am not at fault. If I am in error I want to be corrected. I am acting in good faith, in absolute good faith. I am accepting the figures furnished me by the Army Staff. I suggest that the gentleman ask that the bill be passed for a few minutes and that in the meantime he call up the Army Staff and find out the facts. If I am in error I will withdraw my opposition. Nothing could be fairer than that.

Mr. McKENZIE. Have you the report there?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have the statistical report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman does not wish to move that it be passed over, I will have to object.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman wants to object I will leave it up to him. It is his responsibility.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13459) extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission and making available funds appropriated under authority of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, for the purpose of controlling the floods of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to Rock Island, Ill., and for the purpose of controlling the floods of the tributaries of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Ohio River and Rock Island, Ill., including levee protection and bank protection, in so far as said tributaries are affected by the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

AUDITOR AND DEPUTY AUDITOR, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3617) to fix the salaries of the auditor and deputy auditor of the Philippine Islands.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we should not at this time, at least not to-day, increase the permanent salaries of these officers. I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over for two weeks without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over for two weeks without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLERKS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND DELEGATES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for pay to clerks to Members of Congress and Delegates.

The title of the resolution was read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, can we have this resolution reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for pay to clerks to Members of Congress and Delegates.

Resolved, etc., That hereafter appropriations made by Congress for clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to one or two persons to be designated by each Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, the names of such persons to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, together with the amount to be paid each; and Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners elect to Congress shall likewise be entitled to make such designations: Provided, That such persons shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. In what respect does this change the present law?

Mr. IRELAND. It makes no change whatever. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. IRELAND. It simply makes permanent law out of the present arrangement. Through an error in drawing the original bill passed in the Sixty-sixth Congress the present arrangement was not made permanent law. It simply continues in effect our present arrangement without any possibility of its being deviated from in the future or the necessity of a new bill being brought in covering the subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, if this becomes permanent law and, say, there is a death among any of the clerks or employees, would this be placing him on the roll permanently? Would this pay the usual six months' salary to his relatives and the \$250 funeral expenses?

Mr. IRELAND. If I may anticipate his thought, I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension, because that already obtains. This would not in any way affect that.

Mr. BLANTON. But it makes it permanent law?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It does not change their present remuneration in any way?

Mr. IRELAND. No.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. This would simply avoid the necessity of passing upon this same question time after time and year after year, making it permanent?

Mr. IRELAND. That very tersely and exactly expresses the situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. IRELAND, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4031) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the State of Illinois, the county of Cook, or the city of Chicago, separately or jointly, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the village of Riverdale, in Cook County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS KANKAKEE RIVER, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4032) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32 township 31 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS KANKAKEE RIVER, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4033) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13195) granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State highway commission of Missouri and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, at a point on the county line between Butler and Dunklin Counties, on the south line of section 3, township 22 north, range 8 east, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906. Such bridge shall be a part of Federal aid project No. 212.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "point," insert the words "suitable to the interests of navigation."

Page 2, line 3, after the figures "1906," strike out the words "such bridge shall be a part of Federal aid project No. 212."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS COLORADO RIVER, YUMA, ARIZ.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4069) to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Colorado River near Yuma, Ariz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation of the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Colorado River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between School Hill, in the Yuma Indian Reservation, in Imperial County, State of California, and Penitentiary Hill, in the town of Yuma, Yuma County, State of Arizona, such bridge to be upstream and easterly from the present highway bridge across the Colorado River between said points, and to be constructed and maintained in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAYDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS BIG SIOUX RIVER, S. DAK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13000) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to direct attention to the fact that under the phraseology of this bill the bridge will have to be erected at a point exactly 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river. I assume that that is not intended, but that it is intended to authorize the construction of a bridge at any convenient near-by point. So if it meets with the approval of the author of the bill or of the committee, I move to insert the word "about" after the word "point."

Mr. MILLER. "At or near."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, my attention is called to the fact that the Senate bill S. 4131, which has been messaged over to the House, contains the exact phraseology that I have suggested, and therefore I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 4131 and consider it in the place of H. R. 13000.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill S. 4131 for the House bill H. R. 13000. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point about 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the amendment which has just been adopted to the text of the bill.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent H. R. 13000 was laid on the table.

SILVER SERVICE ON BATTLESHIP "SOUTH CAROLINA."

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13351) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of South Carolina the silver service which was used upon the battleship *South Carolina*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of South Carolina, for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was presented by the State of South Carolina and used upon the battleship *South Carolina* while the said battleship was in commission: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12777) granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn., or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Red River of the North.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the cities of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn., or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam across the Red River of the North at or near the cities of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn.: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been filed with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate electricity.

Sec. 2. That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of this dam hereby authorized is commenced within two years and completed within four years from the date hereof.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURTNESS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13271) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill S. 4133, which passed the Senate December 22, be substituted for this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River of the North at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., and that the time for the commencement and completion of such bridge, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, shall be commenced within one year and completed within three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, in order to make the bill conform to the report made by the House committee, I move to amend by eliminating the word "one" where it appears in the phrase "or any one of them."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, a similar change should be made in the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the amendment adopted to the text.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BURTNESS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SAGINAW, SWAN CREEK, AND BLACK RIVER BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3184) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I think the House should have some information as to this bill, and particularly as to the reason why the claims have not been prosecuted in the Court of Claims before this. As I read the bill and the report, it increases the maximum that they may be allowed for attorney fees.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, as I am going to object, I will object now.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Texas to reserve his objection for a moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection to the gentleman's asking to retain the bill in its place on the calendar.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I would like to give the House some information in regard to it.

Mr. BLANTON. I took it for granted that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was going to object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not say that I was going to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the information which the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes I think I can supply. These Indians which this bill seeks to relieve are residents of my district, and I know the circumstances very well. I will say that since the act of 1910 was passed they have been trying to find some competent Indian attorney who would take the case on the terms offered in the bill, which was a maximum fee of \$10,000, but were unable to do so. We have had a long conference with the Indian Affairs Commissioner, who has agreed to the provisions of the bill as presented here. The bill as it is written provides that the claim must be filed within three years. Further, the bill permits the Court of Claims to fix the amount to be paid to the attorneys in the case, but limits it in any event to \$25,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many of these Indians still survive?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Several hundred.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do they live in tribal relations?

Mr. WOODRUFF. No; they are all law-abiding, self-respecting citizens of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the nature of their claims?

Mr. WOODRUFF. The claims arose when they lived under tribal relations.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the nature of the claims?

Mr. WOODRUFF. It is for the nonfulfillment of contracts entered into with the United States Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the total amount of the claims?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. It would amount to more than \$250,000?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I should think it would be very much more than that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have they any other claims against the Government?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. STAFFORD. These old, musty claims should not be revived; but if they have any real claims against the Government, they ought to be given an opportunity to establish them.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I quite agree with the gentleman, and for that reason introduced this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Michigan that they were unable to get a competent attorney to look after their rights is a satisfactory explanation in answer to my inquiry, and I withdraw my reservation of an objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That upon the final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to decree the fees to be paid to the attorney or attorneys employed by the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians, and the same shall be paid out of any sum or sums found due the said band of Indians."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 2 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That any suit or suits under this act shall be begun within three years after passage hereof by the filing of a petition to be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by the claimant Indians under contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in accordance with existing law. The compensation to be paid such attorney or attorneys shall be determined by the Court of Claims and shall not exceed the sum of 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered, and in no event shall such fee or fees exceed the sum of \$25,000, and the same shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due the Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS, STATE OF INDIANA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8573) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, the establishment of judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEVENSON. Reserving the right to object, it seems to me that as we have just had a reorganization of the judicial districts of the country and added some 25 judges, I do not understand if this was a pressing case why it was not provided for in that instance. I should like to look into the matter if the gentleman will let it go over until the next unanimous-consent day.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I think after the gentleman hears the explanation he will not object to it. The reason this was not included in the Walsh bill was in order that we might establish a judicial code, so to speak, for the State of Indiana, have the State divided into districts and also into divisions. It was felt that to include this bill in the regular bill might possibly complicate the matter to some extent. At this time Indiana has but one judge and one judicial district. Its population is about 3,000,000 people. It is the tenth largest State in point of population in the United States and the eleventh so far as resources are concerned. It is a State with a great many railroads. Nearly every railroad that enters Chicago from the East crosses its surface. Under the present system, established in 1838, we have but one judge and one district.

The people residing in the northern part of the State, which is densely populated, and which has a large number of industrial concerns and a great many interests of various kinds, must go to Indianapolis, a distance of more than 150 miles, with all of their litigation, whether it be important or trivial. The purpose of this bill is to correct that situation. I also call his attention, and the attention of the Members of the House, to the fact that other States have been amply provided for, including the State of the gentleman from South Carolina, with judicial facilities. In his State, which has a population of 1,683,724, there are two judges and two districts. In Alabama, with a population of 2,384,174, there are three judges and three districts, and I might go on and enumerate in each State the provisions that have been made to take care of the Federal business of the State. Taking the northern part of Indiana, I call attention to the fact that located there are the great steel industries, the Studebaker automobile manufacturing concern, the Oliver Chalmers Plow Co., and other large interests. In a very small territory we have more than 600,000 population, which is two districts.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman explain why this additional judge was not included in the judges bill that we passed at the last session of Congress?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes; because the additional judge would do us no good unless we had the State divided into districts and divisions. We would then be compelled, as we are now, to go to Indianapolis with all of our Federal law matters.

Mr. TILSON. Was Indiana put in as one of the States that needed an additional judge?

Mr. HICKEY. Indiana was not included in that bill, but this bill was considered by Mr. WALSH, as chairman of the subcommittee, who had charge of the other bill, and was considered by the judicial committee, and a unanimous report was made to this House after the passage of the other bill.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES] in favor of this bill?

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. MOORES, I dare say, is opposed to the bill. He lives in Indianapolis, and I dare say he is opposed to the bill.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It seems to me that he ought to be here when the bill is considered.

Mr. HICKEY. The bill has been on the calendar for some time.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. He has just left the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have been trying to find out where he is. I think the gentleman better ask to have the bill go over without prejudice, else I shall have to object.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the situation which I mean. I do not care anything about it myself, but I ask not to let it be passed because the gentleman wanted to be heard about it. I have no objection to the bill being passed over without prejudice, but unless that can be done I shall object to its consideration.

Mr. HICKEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to pass the bill over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was S. J. Res. 258, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some member of the Committee on the Library who Mr. Irwin B. Laughlin is, whom it is intended to

appoint in place of the late Alexander Graham Bell. As no one seems to be here from that committee, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PUNISHMENT OF ASSAULT ON MAIL CARRIERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 2573, to amend section 198 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in examining the statute which was in force before the amendments of May 18, 1915, and July 28, 1916, which this bill seeks to reincorporate, that instead of its being "shall willfully or maliciously assault" it was "and maliciously assault." There is a great difference in respect to the crime of assault, if it be willful without cause or provocation, and if it be willful and malicious. Can any gentleman from the Committee on the Post Office furnish some information as to whether that is intentional or not?

I hear no response, and under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PINEY BRANCH ROAD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1066) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Piney Branch Road between Seventeenth and Taylor Streets and Sixteenth and Allison Streets NW., rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening and extension of streets called for in the permanent highway plan of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ESCAMBIA RIVER NEAR FERRY PASS, FLA.

The next business in order on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13493) to authorize the State Road Department of the State of Florida to construct, maintain and operate a bridge across the Escambia River near Ferry Pass, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the State Road Department of the State of Florida, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Escambia River, Fla., and its tributaries, between Pensacola and Milton, near Ferry Pass, Fla., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Florida," insert the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITHWICK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE GREAT PEE DEE RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River in South Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Marlboro and Darlington be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Great Pee Dee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and at or near Society Hill, in Darlington County, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on H. R. 3184.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER AT ROCKFORD, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13474) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Winnebago, the town of Rockford, and the city of Rockford, in said county, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Winnebago, the town of Rockford, and the city of Rockford, in said county, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the extension of Auburn Street in said city of Rockford, and in section 13, township 44 north, range 1 east, of the third principal meridian, in the county of Winnebago and State of Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to address the House out of order for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to address the House out of order for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. May I inquire upon what subject?

Mr. HILL. On the subject of the recent reflections upon the House of Representatives in reference to certain charges.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Iowa.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FULLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MANAGERS OF THE NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) for the appointment of three members of the board of managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That James W. Wadsworth, of New York; H. H. Markham, of California; and W. S. Albright, of Kansas, be, and they are hereby, appointed members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States, to succeed James W. Wadsworth, of New York; H. H. Markham, of California; and W. S. Albright, of Kansas, whose terms of office expire April 21, 1922.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ST. PAUL, MINN.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13511) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the point where Robert Street, in said city of St. Paul, crosses the Mississippi River, in the county of Ramsey, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SETTING ASIDE CERTAIN LANDS, QUINAUT INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH., FOR LIGHTHOUSE PURPOSES.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11475) to authorize the setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinault Indian Reservation in Washington for lighthouse purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this bill being considered, but do not waive the right to have it considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman wishes this considered in the Committee of the Whole House? Is there objection to the consideration of this bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11475, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11475, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11475) to authorize the setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinault Indian Reservation in Washington for lighthouse purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety gentlemen are present—

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I move that the committee rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. LINTHICUM) reported that there were—ayes 2, noes 102. So the committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum of the committee is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee—

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for information. I want to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Not until later.

Mr. STEVENSON. I would like to find out upon what this whole discussion is to be had.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall be very glad to be interrupted for questions after presenting this matter to the House, but I should prefer not to yield until after I have gone over the matters which I wish to present to you.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the reverend and learned Cotton Mather, D. D., writing the church history of New England in 1696, made some observations which are very pertinent and relevant to the situation existing at the present time in this House. Said he:

In the year 1654 a certain windmill in the low countries, whirling round with extraordinary violence, by reason of a violent storm then blowing, the stone at length by its rapid motion became so intensely hot as to fire the mill, from whence the flames, being dispersed by the high winds, did set a whole town on fire. But I can tell my reader that about 20 years before this there was a whole country in America like to be set on fire by the rapid motion of a windmill in the head of one particular man. * * * Who, being a preacher that had less light than fire in him, both by his own sad example, preached unto us the danger of that evil which the apostle mentions in Romans x:2. They have a zeal, but not according to knowledge.

Nearly 300 years after the events recorded by Doctor Mather, to be exact, on December 20, 1922, and again on January 9,

1923, the Hon. Mr. UPSHAW, of Georgia, a Member of this House, made certain charges against Members of this House, against Senators of the United States, against governors of the sovereign States, and others upon whom the responsibility of American government rests, the character of those charges being clearly described in the following words of the Columbia Sentinel, the paper of the late Senator Thomas E. Watson. I quote the exact words of an editorial in that paper as presented to this House last week. In an address by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] these are the words of the late Senator Watson's editorial in his paper, the spirit of Senator Watson still speaking through that paper:

UPSHAW'S advice to the men "higher up" is good sense, sound law, and wholesome honesty. If public officials themselves violate one of our laws, what right have they to jail the average man for committing the same sin?

Mr. UPSHAW'S charge is not a mere exhortation to Christmas piety. It is a definite charge, and it is made as a definite charge, and it has gone throughout the whole United States as a charge that we Members of Congress violate the laws that we are sworn to defend. These charges, gentlemen of the House, are not charges which should be broadcasted over the United States unchallenged. The time has come, my colleagues, when we should consider the position of this House in reference to criticisms that are made throughout the Nation. Proper criticism is right; but we should resent criticism that is not based on facts. I repeat, gentlemen, these charges are not charges that should be broadcasted over the United States unchallenged. I might say in passing that I telephoned to the office of Mr. UPSHAW this morning and said I proposed to take up this matter as soon as possible.

On January 9 the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] said here in this House concerning his charge of December 20:

When I made that innocent and well-intentioned little speech only 13 minutes long, I did not dream that it would carry its honest message in flaming headlines on the front page of nearly every great daily and country paper in America.

That is the estimation by the gentleman from Georgia of what he has done in his little 13-minute speech. And the gentleman from Georgia gloated over the fact that his "message in flaming headlines" had branded you and me, Members of this House, indiscriminately as hypocrites and violators of the laws made by this House for the Government of this Nation.

I wonder where the gentleman from Georgia got those words, "Message in flaming headlines"? Was he thinking of a flaming cross on a Mer Rouge (La.) hilltop?

They made me think of Cotton Mather's human windmill; and they made me think of other reflections of Cotton Mather relating to that same human windmill.

Cotton Mather said:

And that which increased in them the suspicion of his ill character was partly, indeed, his refusing to communicate with the church of Boston * * * which the New England reformers thought then would be to carry the matter as far beyond their sense as the vulgar translation has done to the text of Luke 15:8, where, instead of "everit domum," she swept the house, it reads "everit domem," or she overset it.

I think the gentleman from Georgia in trying to sweep the house of prohibition has helped to "overset it," for if, as he says, governors, Members of Congress, Senators, and other high officials deride the eighteenth amendment and violate the Volstead Act, certainly that shows that the American people, who elect these same high officials, consider the Volstead Act as a joke. If they did not, would they elect such law-violating officials?

So the gentleman from Georgia has raised an upsetting dilemma. If his flaming charges are true, the Volstead Act, being obsolete to the Nation's high officials, should be repealed. If his charges are not true, he should admit that with more zeal than knowledge he has branded you and me as lawbreakers.

But, in the words of Cotton Mather, I can tell my hearers that about 30 years ago the whole of America was likely to be set on fire by the rapid motion of a windmill in the head of one particular man, the Hon. Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, a Member of this House. He made general charges against the Members of this House, which I read into the Record on December 30, 1922. The House found he had spoken with more zeal than knowledge and that his charges "constituted an unwarranted assault upon the honor and dignity of the House and that such publication has the unqualified disapproval of the House."

I ask your especial attention to this, because these words which I shall read to you are not the words of an exhorter calling you from the illicit practices which in his opinion are being pursued, but they are from a man who specifically charges that you Members of the House of Representatives violate the laws.

I have followed the Watson case in a resolution, which I shall read to you, as follows:

Whereas in a newspaper release of December 20, 1922, purporting to have been written by Hon. WILLIAM DAVID UPSHAW, of Georgia, a Member of the House of Representatives, the following charges appeared:

"The people—the plain people—have cumulative evidence"—

Evidence is not testimony. Evidence is that which convicts—"that some of these 'conferring' governors and many other high officials do not practice the prohibition enforcement which they preach to others."

"Let these governors, led by the President and Vice President of the United States and all the Members of the Cabinet, walk out in the open and lift their hands before high heaven and take a new oath of allegiance to the whole Constitution and the American flag; let them sacredly declare that, regardless of what their tastes and practices have been, they will never again—"

My colleagues, you can not take an oath never again to do a thing unless you admit you have previously done it—they will never again—

And here is what you are charged with all through the headlines, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] boasts, of every paper throughout this country in flaming messages of fire. Here is what you are charged with—

they will never again build up a bootlegger's barbarous business by drinking any form or any amount of illicit liquors—

There is such a thing in this world, thank heaven, at the present time, as legal and licit liquor, but this is about illicit liquor—

at any dinner or any function or in any "ballroom or back alley." Let every Member of Congress and every United States Senator follow suit; and

Whereas the said Hon. WILLIAM DAVID UPSHAW, on December 20, 1922, reiterated the same on the floor of the House; and

Whereas, in a newspaper release, on January 9, 1923, reiterated the same day on the floor of the House, the following additional charges were made by the said Mr. UPSHAW:

"And as for Members of this House, God knows I find no pleasure in this disclosure, but the bright daughter of one of the best men in Congress said to me: 'We are with you. I wish you could stop liquor selling and drinking in this House Office Building.'"

And liquor selling is a violation of more than one law in the District of Columbia—

I wish you could stop liquor selling and drinking in this House Office Building.

In other words, that building, which has been erected by the Nation in order that we may do our work, is being slandered as being the temple of illicit buying and selling of liquor.

And here is a signed letter that says:

"I am a professional bootlegger, told me a year ago, 'The House Office Building furnishes my best customers, and as long as those 'blankety-blanks'—"

My colleagues, he is referring to you and me. Those are the words of Brother UPSHAW, quoting his bootlegger, and not my words. Says Brother UPSHAW's bootlegger—

"as long as those 'blankety-blanks' keep buying I am going to keep on selling." I have reported him several times, but they let him pay a fine and he goes right back to bootlegging. He does nothing else.

We know the situation with reference to exhortation by the Representative from Georgia, but in every little church on Main Street, in every little hamlet in this country, that message has gone to tell the world that you Members of the House, whether you voted straight for prohibition and live straight for prohibition, are hypocrites and law violators.

I want to make the public statement right here that I have two daughters, but one of them is only 2 and the other one only 6, and neither one of my daughters made that statement to UPSHAW's bootlegger.

Then comes a quotation from the Columbia Sentinel, the late Senator Watson's paper, which shows the intent of these charges:

The Columbia Sentinel, the paper of the late Senator Thomas E. Watson, enjoying a national circulation, and now edited by the brilliant former secretary of Senator Watson, Grover C. Edmondson, says:

"UPSHAW's advice to the men 'higher up' is good sense, sound law, and wholesome honesty. If public officials themselves violate one of our laws, what right have they to jail the average man for committing the same sin?" And

"Whereas the publication of said charges, if untrue, are a grave wrong to this body, and if true, the responsibility should be placed where it belongs;

"Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House be directed to investigate and report to the House whether said charges are true, and, if untrue, whether the said Hon. WILLIAM DAVID UPSHAW has violated the privileges of the House, and their recommendations relative to the same: Resolved further, That said Judiciary Committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, and to compel their attendance."

Gentlemen, if these charges are true, the knell of prohibition has sounded, because it shows that the law is a joke. If these charges are not true, we should vindicate the honor of this House. I shall move the previous question on this resolution at the earliest possible occasion.

The gentleman from Georgia has called me the "wet nurse" of the House. I accept the title with gratitude. He has placed me in the class with that great protagonist of civilization—the wolf that suckled Romulus and Remus, and that has come down through the ages embalmed in bronze.

But as a Member of this House I esteem its honor more than bronzed fame; and so to-day I demand that the gentleman from Georgia prove his charges true or untrue before the Judiciary Committee. And in confidence I will say to you I have never had a drink, licit or illicit, with any member of the Judiciary Committee at any time in any place. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to set aside for lighthouse purposes lot 5 in section 13 and lot 1 in section 24, township 21 north, range 13 west, of Willamette meridian, within the Quinalt Indian Reservation in Washington, containing a total of 43.20 acres: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall pay the Indians therefor, from the appropriation for the general expenses of the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year in which this reservation is made, such price for the lands set aside hereunder as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the funds thus derived shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of the Quinalt Reservation and shall be subject to expenditure for their benefit in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may deem for their best interests.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby reserved for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Quinalt Reservation in common all oil, gas, coal, or other minerals in the lands set aside hereunder for lighthouse purposes, and the right to prospect for and mine these commodities under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Reservation," strike out the words "and shall be subject to expenditure for their benefit in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may deem for their best interests."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11475) to authorize the setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinalt Indian Reservation in Washington for lighthouse purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WEST FORK OF SOUTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3177) declaring a portion of the West Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Cook County, Ill., to be a nonnavigable stream.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not intend to object to the bill, but I think there should be some explanation before it passes the objection stage, because of the importance of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to be explained to the House. So far as I know, there is no opposition to it, but it is a very important proposition. I do not want to be prolix, or to take too much time with it, but I will state briefly what it is.

The Chicago River extends west from Lake Michigan about half a mile and then divides into two branches, one of which runs north and the other of which runs south. The South Branch runs south about three miles and a half and then divides into two branches. The West Branch runs west about 8 miles to a high divide that separates the waters of the Chicago River and the Des Plaines River, forming a sort of watershed there. Many, many years ago travelers coming up the Illinois River from Mississippi came up the Des Plaines River, and then car-

ried their canoes, their furs, and other freight from one water pool to another, and finally got into the Chicago River over this old trail.

It was abandoned. The last travel over it that we know anything about was early in the last century. But for 150 years it was a pretty well marked trail. After that it degenerated into a sort of meandering watercourse that ran through the prairies with very little water in it for about 7 miles of length. Some years after it was abandoned two men, who owned land along its course, drained the swamp lands by constructing a drainage ditch along the line of this old watercourse, called the Ogden ditch. That was abandoned, and to-day in this part of the stream in some places you can hardly see the channel at all, and at other places the old channel is full of sewage which runs into it from the intersecting sewers. This makes places that breed disease, and this part of the river is of no account for navigation at all. Numerous committees of Congress have been out to look at it, and all have decided that it is not a navigable stream and is of no importance.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is a stream navigable until it is declared so?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has this stream ever been declared navigable, or is it so by reason of some other facts?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The Supreme Court of Illinois, in a recent case, the Economy Light & Power Co. case, held that originally this branch of the river was navigable, and commented on the fact that fur traders and the voyageurs had, for 150 years, crossed that part of the country, because it was the most available way to get to the Mississippi River.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will realize that with reference to a stream that is navigable there are certain public rights concerning which the whole people are interested.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. To declare a stream nonnavigable by Congress, if there were such rights as were valuable, would take away the rights from the people.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I understand, and there is no man in this House that is more insistent on water navigation than am I.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this stream the only source of carrying off and removing the sewage of that locality?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; if the local authorities could fill up the old watercourse they would construct intersecting sewers into the Chicago Drainage Canal, which runs 1,500 feet south and in a parallel course to this stream its entire length.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, knowing this was a somewhat important bill, and it being located in the center of the city of Chicago, sent a subcommittee there, consisting of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] and myself, to look into it. We held hearings in the Federal building for three days. We notified everybody, the State, the city, the sanitary district, and everybody concerned, and had extensive hearings, which have been printed. We have gone into the law as far as we can go. We satisfied ourselves about the facts. This stream is not navigable; it is of no importance as a navigable stream; it will never be of any importance, because near it is the sanitary district canal, 23 feet deep on the average, 250 feet broad, sufficient to carry all navigation that may at any time come up that river. So there is no reasonable objection to it. The State of Illinois, which ordinarily insists strenuously on keeping all streams intact, is not offering any particular objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know anything about this stream; I do not know its width or its availability for redemption, as far as property rights are concerned; but suppose it could be filled up and reclaimed and become valuable property. As it is now, no one has any property rights concerning a navigable stream. If you remove that obstacle and declare it nonnavigable and it should be taken over and filled up and made valuable property, some people might get the benefit of it. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. As a matter of fact, in some places you can step across it, and in some places you can hardly see that there is a channel. Every once in a while you find a pool of water which is largely a cesspool. There is not much of a stream. But it having been declared to be a navigable stream by the decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois some action on the part of Congress will be necessary before the local laws will apply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I have not read the hearings, but I would like to ask the gentleman if the people of Chicago object to it?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; this bill was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], and a similar bill was introduced in the House by Mr. MICHAELSON, a Representative from Illinois. We had all the representatives of the city, the sanitary district, and the State of Illinois before us, and there was no objection made to this particular proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Was notice given to the people?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It was, it was advertised in the papers; we had news articles in the papers; we sent letters to everybody who had ever written us about it; and we were extremely careful on that point because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] and I both are, as you know, firm advocates of water transportation, and we are not going to do anything that is going to let a useful watercourse be filled up if we can help it.

Mr. STEPHENS. Who will own this property when it is declared nonnavigable and filled up?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Under the law of Illinois the rule is this: Where a stream is navigable and is abandoned as a navigable stream the abutting landowners acquire title to the middle of the thread of the old channel.

Mr. STEPHENS. Then the abutting landowners will receive the benefit of this?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. They will.

Mr. STEPHENS. Then they are particularly interested in it?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; we had no representations from any of them.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would it not benefit them to the extent of millions of dollars?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Let me explain. The movement comes from the city of Chicago. They propose to run Blue Island Avenue, which is one of the principal avenues of the city, right down over the line of this old ditch, clear through into the western part of the city toward a zoological garden, and to make a great highway of what to-day is a stinking, offensive stream that is of no value. The plan, the movement, seems to have originated in the authorities of the city of Chicago.

Mr. STEPHENS. Yet this land would not go to the city of Chicago?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The city will get it by condemnation proceedings.

Mr. STEPHENS. And it will have to pay the abutting property owners?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It is willing to do that.

Mr. STEPHENS. How much will that amount to?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not know. The land on either side of this old ditch is not improved very much at this time. People will not move in there and construct buildings or manufacturing institutions; and just what the land is worth, I do not know. However, the city of Chicago, by condemnation proceedings, will have to acquire the right of way. Sometimes the new road will be right in the middle of the old channel, and sometimes it will cut across corners, and so on; but the city of Chicago will have to pay for it, and the people of that city are willing to do that.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. In what portion of Chicago is this stream?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It is in the southwest section. It runs out toward the village of Des Plaines.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does it connect up with the canal or the Chicago River?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes; in the south part of the city, down about Thirty-ninth Street, the Chicago River forks. The west fork runs in a southwesterly direction about 7 or 8 miles toward Des Plaines. For about a mile and a half west of the fork of the river the river might be used for some navigable purposes. At that point, a mile and a half west of the fork and extending south from the river to the Sanitary District Canal, is a collateral channel, as it is called, of the Sanitary District Canal, which has made a large loop of water there.

The people of Chicago wanted the committee to adopt an amendment which also provides for the abandonment of that portion of the river within the loop, but Mr. DENISON and I were unitedly opposed to that proposition, and when we reported it to the committee the committee agreed with us, so

that the only portion involved is the portion west of the collateral channel, which is an old meandering ditch.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Does not the Des Plaines Canal, which I think ran from the Illinois River, connect with this branch?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman means the Illinois and Michigan Canal?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; the old Des Plaines Canal.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No. I never knew of any canal that connected the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. There was a canal called the Des Plaines Canal, and I thought that was the canal which connected the Chicago River with the Illinois River through Des Plaines.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the Illinois and Michigan Canal to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Along about 1848 a canal was dug from the Des Plaines River to the Chicago River called the Illinois and Michigan Canal, which was used for many years and finally abandoned when the railroads practically put a stop to its business.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This is not the Des Plaines River?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; this is a branch of the Chicago River. The old bed of the Illinois and Michigan Canal still exists, still furnishes adequate terminal facilities if it was ever desired, and in addition to this there is the sanitary district and ship canal, which has a good depth of water and also parallels it within a short distance.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This would not interfere with that canal?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not in the least.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of that portion of the West Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, extending west from the west line of the Collateral Channel of the sanitary district of Chicago, in the northwest quarter of section 36, township 39 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian, be, and the same is hereby, declared to be a nonnavigable stream within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DENISON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INDIANS ON THE LAC COURTE OREILLE INDIAN RESERVATION IN WISCONSIN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13655) to validate certain allotments of land made to Indians on the Lac Courte Oreille Indian Reservation in Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am acquainted somewhat by general rumor and what comes from reading the papers of Milwaukee that years back there were allotments of Indian land in which there were large stands of timber made to Indians without right, which were appropriated by the so-called timber interests of the State. There have been some bills proposed to confirm those titles. I wish to know whether the bill sought is to confirm the title of allotted lands that were granted without right, where the poor Indian got little or nothing because he had no right to the land, and the lumberman who took his paper title and got possession and now wishes to have his title confirmed?

Mr. BURNES. The necessity and reason for the bill are that under the law passed in 1854, providing for allotments to the Indians, such allotments should only be made to heads of families or to single persons who were above the age of 21 years.

Pursuant to the provisions of that law, however, an allotting agent made allotments which were erroneous, or at least which were not justified under the provisions of that law in this, that he made some allotments to minors who were under the age of 21 years, and he also made some allotments to married women who were not the heads of families.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why did he violate the power which was vested in him to grant land, and very likely valuable timberland, to persons who were incompetent and could not dispose of their land? Then comes along some representative of lumber companies and buys this land for a mere pittance and sells the timber at full value, and now comes to the Government when the land has become valuable and asks confirmation of title.

Mr. BURNES. The information given by the bureau is that it was done through error, through inadvertence on the part of the allotting agent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any testimony to the effect it was done through inadvertence and error?

Mr. BURNES. That is the statement made by the assistant commissioner before the committee. Now, if the gentleman will permit me to finish my explanation, I want to make it plain to him and the House that the law passed in 1903 permitted allotments to be made to single persons under 21 years of age and to married women who might not be heads of families. In other words, the situation is this: If the erroneous allotment as made by the allotting agent under the provision of the 1854 act prior to 1903 had in effect been made at any time during the last 19 years, then there would be no question whatsoever as to the validity of the act of the allotting agent, so all that this legislation will do, if passed, is simply to cure it, to make the older allotments valid in the same way as if they had been made since the 1903 act went into effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under this act of 1903 the Indian agent was authorized to allot to married women. There the authority was bestowed. But in these old allotments there was no authority whatsoever. I want it clear in my mind it was not done by design to get these valuable Indian lands with rare white-pine timber into the possession of the lumber interests.

Mr. BURNES. But the fact is that ever since 1903 this very land could have been allotted and has been allotted, a great many of them, to married women who are not the heads of families and to minors under the age of 21 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under authority of law?

Mr. BURNES. Yes; passed in 1903, which was doubtless the intent at that time, for that was the policy that Congress established. And so the committee thought that such allotments as had been made erroneously prior to that time, but which, however, are in direct accord with the policy as outlined by Congress in the 1903 act, that there was no reason why such prior allotments should not be made valid, and therefore reported this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the right to object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman that after a very careful consideration of this bill we found that all it would do would simply be to correct an error which was made in these allotments when originally made, and there is really nobody being hurt or favored by it in any event, and we thought that the bill ought to be passed to clear up the situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That such allotments of land to Indians on the Lac Courte Oreille Indian Reservation in Wisconsin and the restricted fee patents issued therefor, under the provisions of article 3 of the treaty of September 30, 1854 (10 Stat. L., p. 1109), which allotments are not within the provisions of the treaty because of the ages of the allottees or their status as heads of families at the time the allotments were made, be, and the same are hereby, validated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURNES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LANDS DEVISED TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT BY THE LATE JOSEPH BATTELL, OF MIDDLEBURY, VT.

The next business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) concerning lands devised to the United States Government by the late Joseph Battell, of Middlebury, Vt.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not recall whether this particular question has been presented to the Speaker for decision or not, where a person by will offers land to the Government under certain conditions and the Congress decides not to accept the gift, whether it should be by joint resolution rather than by concurrent resolution. I wish to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that this is a Senate concurrent resolution. I have given some

little thought to it. I am of the opinion that this should be a joint resolution that should be presented to the President for his approval. True the Government has no title to-day to the land. It has not even an inchoate interest, and yet it would have title if the Government should pass a law accepting the land upon the terms provided in the will of the testator. I think in a matter of that kind the question is legislative in its character and should be submitted to the President of the United States for approval. It is not of the relationship of matters between the two Houses, wherein the President is not interested, which are generally embodied in a concurrent resolution.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I offer a suggestion?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly. I am seeking enlightenment. I was asking whether it should not be submitted to the President instead of being embodied in a concurrent resolution. I am not objecting to the merits of the provision. I think the grant should be rejected.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would make any difference what you call the resolution, whether concurrent or joint. A concurrent resolution, if it contains legislation, as I understand it, goes to the President. I have very hurriedly looked up the matter, and in the Manual, section 389, it is stated—

A concurrent resolution is binding upon neither House until agreed to by both. It is not sent to the President for approval unless it contain a proposition of legislation which is not within the scope of the modern form of concurrent resolution.

Now, if it is held that it contains a proposition of legislation it would necessarily go to the President under this citation.

The SPEAKER. If it requires the President's signature, why should it not be a joint resolution?

Mr. SINNOTT. It does not make much difference what you call it.

The SPEAKER. A joint resolution requires the President's signature.

Mr. SINNOTT. A concurrent resolution requires the signature of the President if it contains a proposition of legislation. However, it seems to me that this is not a proper parliamentary objection at this time to the measure. It is a criticism, but not an objection that the Chair can entertain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; the enacting clause would have to be changed. I have never known a concurrent resolution to pass either House that was submitted to the President. Concurrent resolutions are intended to be limited in purpose to the action of the two bodies. If the author of the resolution in another body has made a mistake, let us have the courage to admit that he has done so. I have said to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] that I had no objection on the merits of the resolution.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman propose to arrest this measure entirely? You can not amend a thing of this nature in parliamentary process now. It means the re-introduction of this resolution from the other end again.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can introduce a House resolution.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I do not pretend to be versed enough in parliamentary procedure to make a fine argument on the relative value of a concurrent and a joint resolution and the action of Congress upon them. This is not a case where Congress is being asked to make a law in the sense that it is to be followed as a rule and guide for the action of anybody, and therefore needs the approval of the President to make it a law.

It is a case where the court merely refused to distribute some property to the residuary legatee until the two Chambers of Congress themselves had decided whether they want to pass a law accepting the bequest or not. The history of this thing shows plainly what they had in mind. The Senate resolution was originally acted upon by the Senate committee and reported by the committee adversely, whereupon the measure was changed; that it was the sense of Congress that it did not want to accept the gift.

Mr. STAFFORD. But Congress should have the right to pass upon whether that gift should be accepted or not. It is a legislative enactment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It was in the form of a resolution to show the intent of the two Houses, and not what the two Houses with the signature of the President would put into effect. It is negative.

The SPEAKER. It is clear to the Chair that the action must be the action of the United States Government, of which the President is a part, and that he is just as much entitled to be heard on it as Congress. The Chair thinks at first blush that it ought to be a joint resolution; and the Chair would suggest, although it is a rather awkward way to do it, that he does not

see why a concurrent resolution could not be amended into a joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move, Mr. Speaker, as a substitute the following. I withdraw the reservation of an objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move as a substitute the following: After the preamble, insert in lieu of the resolving clause the following: "*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the acceptance of said devise," and so forth, providing the enacting phraseology which always accompanies a joint resolution, as distinguished from a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept said devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Clerk has not yet reported the amendment. I offer as a substitute, Mr. Speaker, the following: "Strike out of the title the word 'concurrent' and substitute the word 'joint,' so as to make it a joint resolution."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out of the title "Concurrent Resolution No. 30" and insert "Joint Resolution No. —."

Mr. STAFFORD. And also in the title substitute "joint" for "concurrent." And for the resolving phraseology substitute the usual phraseology which accompanies a joint resolution as follows: "*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*," in lieu of the "the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out in the caption at the head of the preamble the word "concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "joint," and in the resolving clause strike out "Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)," and insert—

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert: "*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*" in lieu of "the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since I have been in Congress that the Government has turned down a gift from anybody.

Mr. SINNOTT. A white elephant.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is a man in Vermont who offered to the Government 3,900 acres of valuable land, and I am glad to commend the Senate of the United States for not accepting it. It was not land that was suitable for a national park, although the owner offered it for that purpose. But he expected the United States Government, if it accepted it, to maintain it as a national park, with roadways and caretakers and the annual expenses incident to all national parks. Every few days we hear of some charitably minded person wanting to give something to the United States. We ought to scrutinize such gifts carefully. There are some gifts that an individual can not afford to take. There are some gifts that a Government can not afford to take.

I notice that another charitably minded individual, who has passed away lately, has offered property for establishing what he calls a summer White House somewhere else than in Washington. There should be but one White House in this Government of ours, and that is here in Washington. There is too much growing tendency to create aristocracies and to follow

the example set up by royalty in other countries, by monarchies in other countries. Certain people would have a summer White House in the North, and an autumn White House somewhere else, and a winter White House in Florida. It is following European example a little too much. I am against it all, and I believe the people of this country want a little more simplicity in the manner of their living, beginning with the Chief Officer of the land.

When we consider the estimates of expenses appearing in a divorce court in New York as to what one separated wife and children need for their annual expenses, which the court is asked to set aside to them each year, it is a shock to American institutions, I do not care how wealthy a person may be. The waste of their property along such lines is not according to American ideals.

Last Saturday this grass widow requested a court of equity to make her an annual allowance out of her husband's estate for the following expenses each year, to wit:

Apartment rent, \$13,000; certain employees, \$500; trained nurse, \$2,100; cook, \$1,500; kitchen maid, \$720; housemaid, \$900; two laundresses, \$1,800; butler, \$1,800; for cleaning apartment, \$520; personal maid, \$900; cost of food, \$16,500; for maintaining motor car, \$5,300; tutors for two boys, \$3,000; secretary, \$3,000; clothing for two sons, \$4,500; clothing for self, \$15,000; maintaining summer place, \$9,600; traveling expenses during summer, \$15,000; incidental expenses, such as stamps, car fare, and so forth, \$5,000; doctor bills, \$6,000; dentist bills, \$4,000; amusements, books, and concerts, \$3,500; toys, gifts, birthday and Christmas presents, \$1,000; insurance, \$1,500; furniture, \$10,000; son's vacation expenses, \$3,000, and extra tutoring, \$1,500; contributions, \$3,000; and gratuities, \$5,000.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENISON. Under the custom which has grown up our White House now is quite a public place, and the public object to its being closed or even to the grounds being closed. It is always open to tourists, and there is very little opportunity for that quiet and rest that the President ought to have. What objection has the gentleman from Texas to the President, like other people, having an opportunity to have a quiet place where he can take his family and get some rest during certain months of the year?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no such thing as rest for the President of the United States, I do not care whether it is in a White House in Florida, or in Maine, or in the White House in Washington. But there is seclusion for him. Of all the many visitors who go to the White House each day very few see the President. The President never sees them. Of course he sees some by appointment, but he rarely ever sees the great hordes of visitors who enter the doors of the White House. He is never bothered by them.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who is an active Member of this House and who takes an interest in all its proceedings, will study the history of the constant increase in appropriations for the Chief Executive of this Nation, an increase that has been growing not only under Republican administrations but under Democratic administrations as well—if the gentleman will look back 50 years he will be astounded. It ought not to be carried too far. The Chief Executive of this Nation is the chief of the greatest Republic in the world and represents the finest people in the world, but he is not a monarch. He is the executive officer of the American people. He is an American. We must not get away from that idea with all of its full significance.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENISON. Of course it is not un-American—I am sure my friend from Texas will agree that it is not at all un-American—that the President of our country should be given an opportunity to have a quiet place where he can take his family and get a little rest. If we can give him that opportunity, does not the gentleman from Texas think that this is too great a Nation to quibble and dispute and quarrel over a little matter of that kind; and if we can do that for our President, does not the gentleman think we ought to do so?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois knows well that if we establish a summer White House away from Washington it will not be a year before there will be a move on foot to establish a winter White House down in Florida. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. DENISON. No; I do not know that.

Mr. BLANTON. Then he is not the discerning gentleman I thought he was. His discernment does not take in quite the scope I thought it did.

Mr. DENISON. I have not as much imagination as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. No; the gentleman from Texas is looking upon facts based on past history. We are now spending \$25,000 to equip the *Mayflower* with oil burners instead of coal, and there is a movement on foot now to buy for the Vice President of the United States a magnificent mansion out here on Sixteenth Street, in Mount Pleasant, that is now held there, vacant, waiting for Congress to buy it—to be called the Vice President's White House.

There is not a man in this Nation who appreciates more highly than I do the Vice President of this country. He is one of the biggest men in the Nation. There is only one thing that kept me from voting for him, and that is the fact that he is a Republican. If it had not been for his party affiliations I might have voted for him. But however much we admire him, we must draw the line against this drifting into what I call the Old World aristocracy that our forefathers ran away from when they established this American Republic. I want to say to the people who built that mansion out yonder on Sixteenth Street that if the rest of my colleagues think about it as I do they might just as well dispose of it in some other way, because we are not going to buy it.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROSE. I think I know what the gentleman had in mind in speaking of the enormous allowance for expenses in a divorce suit in New York. Does the gentleman think that a wife asking 25 per cent of the admitted income of her husband is out of proportion?

Mr. BLANTON. No; if she asked for same as an estate to which she was entitled, if she asked for it as her part of the accumulations earned during marriage, it would be a different thing, for the benefit of herself and her child as their part of the estate, but she is asking merely for a yearly allowance to be spent along certain lines, enough to take care of a small village of needy citizens.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The Vice President has no place to live in, and the gentleman knows—

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman from Illinois himself has none.

Mr. DENISON. No; but the gentleman from Illinois does not have the obligations and duties resting upon him that the Vice President has. His position makes it necessary for him to entertain, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. One minute, right there. There is no man holding office in our Government that has more social responsibility concerning entertaining than does the Secretary of State, and yet he is not furnished a White House by the Government to live in. It would be only a step further when you give a residence to the Vice President, you would also have to give one to the Secretary of State and then all down the line to every member of the Cabinet, and then to Senators and Congressmen.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman can appreciate the fact that there is some difference between the position and the duties of the Vice President and the Secretary of State. The Vice President is compelled to live in hotels, and the gentleman knows enough about hotels in Washington so that he ought to have some sympathy with a man in his position who is compelled to live in high-priced hotels in this city.

Mr. BLANTON. He is not compelled to live in hotels. He could rent a residence.

Mr. DENISON. For fear that the gentleman's expressed sentiments will be taken as the sentiment of the House that the Government ought not to furnish the Vice President with a home, I want to say that I hope the time will soon come when it will do so.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will have some of the citizens from each county in his district come here and let them see how during the past 30 years we have advanced in the way of expenses for both the Chief Executive and for the Vice President, and show them the palatial residences on Sixteenth Street and ask them if they are in favor of buying a residence of that kind for the Vice President, I will guarantee that the gentleman will change his mind. I merely wanted to raise my protest against this growing extravagance, and I only rose for that purpose and to commend the Senate for disapproving this gift and turning it back.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps under the circumstances it might not be improper for me to suggest that the man, Mr. Joseph Battell, who made this original bequest to the Government did so in the utmost good faith and in an attempt to carry out a project for the public benefit which had been one of the ideals of his dreams for many years. Mr. Battell was a man of considerable means and a man of great public spirit and enterprise. In this particular instance he was trying to give the Government of the United States a forest area or reservation for a public park right alongside and in the vicinity of other similar forest land that he had given to the State of Vermont, and which the State of Vermont had accepted. It appears, however, that the old gentleman attached to the gift to the United States such conditions as to acceptance and maintenance of this tract of land that would make it a kind of white elephant, perhaps, and not suitable for the purpose he had in mind, and not suitable for the similar purpose that the State might exercise in the property he had given it near by. So it was felt under the circumstances that, recognizing the practical necessities of the years that have followed his decease, it might not be altogether advisable for the Government to accept the gift notwithstanding the good intentions he had in mind in making his will.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GREENE of Vermont, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the concurrent resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF PARILLO V. KUNZ.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of Elections Committee No. 1, I present a report in the contested-election case of Parillo against Kunz, eighth district of Illinois.

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 8, 1887, TO LANDS PURCHASED BY THE INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 1926, an act to extend the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended, to lands purchased for Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from Arizona would give us some information about this bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to make applicable to lands heretofore or hereafter purchased by Indians the provisions of the general allotment act of 1887 as amended. Under the general allotment act any reservation created for Indians may be allotted not more than 160 acres of grazing land to any one Indian, not more than 100 acres of agricultural land, and not more than 40 acres of irrigated land. Certain tracts of land have been purchased for Indians, about 7,000 acres in California, about 14,000 acres in Wisconsin, and some other lands in Minnesota. The conditions surrounding these purchases are such that the lands could not be allotted, and the title to them remains in the tribe and in the United States. It is certainly good policy to divide up all tribal lands by allotting them to individual members of the tribe in order that they may have the benefits of controlling a particular piece of property and learn how to manage it, the same as any other citizen. If they are incompetent Indians they will be given trust patents, and their affairs will be handled in exactly the same way as is now done with respect to Indian lands.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman let the matter pass over until the next unanimous consent day, to remain on the calendar? A number of these are in my district, and I have not heard from the folks at home in regard to the matter. I ask the gentleman to do that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ROAD ON FORT APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13128) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a road within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized an appropriation of \$15,000 from any tribal funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz., to be immediately available, to pay one-half the cost of constructing a wagon road within said reservation between Cooley and the northeast boundary of said reservation: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation herein authorized shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the county of Apache, Ariz., satisfactory guaranties of the payment by said county of one-half of the cost of the construction of said road.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAYDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TO FILL VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 425, Senate Joint Resolution 258, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 425, Senate Joint Resolution 258, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was first under consideration I sought information as to the gentleman recommended to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Mr. Bell. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] was temporarily out of the Chamber. I understand from the statement furnished to me that it is necessary to take this matter up immediately, for the reason that there is to be a meeting of the Board of Regents on February 8; and as there is to be no further Unanimous-Consent Calendar day this month, I think there should be an exception made in this case. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to returning to this resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the expiration of the term of Alexander Graham Bell, of Washington, D. C., be filled by the appointment of Irwin B. Laughlin, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FESS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MISS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13139) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a railroad bridge across Pearl River at approximately one and one-half miles north of Georgetown, in the State of Mississippi, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, let the bill be reported first, as it is not on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania doing business in the State of Mississippi, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River at approximately one and one-half miles north of Georgetown, in the State of Mississippi, and in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the construction of such bridge shall be commenced within three years from the date of the passage of this act, and shall be completed within five years from the passage of this act.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "at," insert the words "a point suitable to the interests of navigation."
Page 2, line 6, strike out all of section 2.
Page 2, line 10, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "2."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report from the Committee on Flood Control, on a bill which they have ordered to be reported, relating to the flood control of the Mississippi River, may be printed with illustrations.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the class of illustrations?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The illustrations consist of two maps. The plate was made by the Federal Barge Line, a Government corporation on the Mississippi River. It shows the destination of all the freight carried north on the barge line, and the other map shows the points of origin throughout the country of all the freight carried south on the barge line.

The plates are to be furnished free of charge and the Public Printer tells me that the additional cost will be about 2 cents apiece for the report. Under the law I think 1,340 reports have to be printed, so that the cost would be in the neighborhood of \$30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment so that I may ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold the point.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman when he expects we will have an opportunity to take up the Private Calendar? There are now about 120 bills on that calendar.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope some time next week. I am very anxious that we shall have several days' consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withhold his point of no quorum?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a letter from Commissioner Lissner of the Shipping Board in reference to the colloquy in the House the other day as to the edition printed of the so-called Government Aid to Merchant Shipping. Gentlemen will remember there was a colloquy here between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the letter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee is not here—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I looked around for him, and I have tried to find him.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this additional propaganda in behalf of the ship subsidy bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am here, and I shall not make objection, but I would like to have an opportunity to cross-examine him on whatever he says.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this additional propaganda in behalf of the ship subsidy bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; it is merely a statement as to that edition to which reference was made in the discussion the other day.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not in furtherance of the passage of the ship subsidy bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, January 15, 1923.

HON. CARL R. CHINDBLOM,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MR. DEAR MR. CHINDBLOM: On January 12, 1923, Representative DAVIS of Tennessee (page 1691, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) stated:

"I hold in my hand a document of 306 pages, a multigraphed document, and it is expensively bound."

"It costs much more than to have it printed, and I have a written memorandum furnished by an employee of the Shipping Board who is in a position to be familiar with the facts and who is entirely reliable, and he makes the statement that this document, which is simply propaganda and arguments in favor of a certain measure, was prepared in the Shipping Board and by officials and employees of the Shipping Board, and he makes the statement that over 217,000 of these documents were made in the Shipping Board and made out of material paid for by the Government and prepared and made up and distributed by officials in the Shipping Board who were receiving Government salaries. This was distributed throughout the country to newspapers, business organizations, and what not, and at what expense I do not know, but it is in regard to the preparation and distribution of this document that this same official says that 'our duplicating section was working on this issue for several weeks, holding up important work; some duplicating work in connection with the regular routine was laid up over three weeks. Mr. Lasker's orders were to give this pamphlet precedence over everything else.'"

You personally expressed some interest in that statement, and later on (page 1692, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) Congressman EDMONDS stated that he had just received information from me that a thousand copies of the document referred to were all that were made by the Shipping Board, instead of 217,000 copies, as stated by Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. DAVIS questioned the accuracy of that statement and said:

"I said that I had a memorandum furnished by an employee of the Shipping Board in which he stated that that was the fact. He was in the section that issued it."

This statement, as reported by Mr. DAVIS, constitutes such a gross inaccuracy that I feel it my duty to give the facts in this letter, with the request that you ask to have the same printed as a part of the RECORD.

As you well know, the study that was put out under the title "Government Aid to Merchant Shipping," referred to by Mr. DAVIS, was initiated at the special request of the President addressed to Chairman Lasker, and was prepared after months of painstaking investigation by a committee of the best available experts, consisting principally of well-qualified men employed by the Shipping Board and high naval officers, with some advice from practical and professional men not in governmental employ.

It was gotten out in mimeograph form by the Shipping Board's duplicating division largely as a matter of practical convenience and time-saving and because it was being revised and perfected from time to time.

The first edition was limited to 50 copies and was completed January 21, 1922. A revised edition of 100 copies was completed on February 20, 1922; and the final document of 306 pages (referred to by Mr. DAVIS, of which, as stated, exactly 1,000 copies were printed), was completed March 28, 1922.

This large edition, as stated by Mr. EDMONDS, was gotten up especially so that each Member of Congress might be furnished a copy, which was done. As might have been expected, there were requests for copies immediately made by the press correspondents and some others entitled to same, which were gladly furnished, and the remainder of the edition, amounting to about 50 copies, we still have on hand.

Far from being "expensively bound," the document, as may easily be ascertained by a mere glance at it, is cheaply and roughly bound in paper.

The Shipping Board makes no apology for its actions in this matter in furnishing as quickly as possible to the Congress and to representatives of the leading press associations copies of a comprehensive and expert study as to the result of which there was at the time a great deal of justifiable interest, and which legislators and the country were entitled to be informed concerning at the earliest possible day.

It is true that our duplicating section was working on this issue of 1,000 copies off and on for several weeks and that some other routine work was laid aside at times during that period. Quite properly orders were given that this work should have the right of way over ordinary matters of routine that could be postponed without detriment to the service. In all about 10 days' solid time was put in by our duplicating force on the edition referred to. At this rate it would have taken about 2,170 working days, or about seven years, solid time to print the mythical 217,000 copies referred to by Mr. DAVIS and his informant.

Members of Congress may therefore judge whether the Shipping Board employee referred to is "entirely reliable" and a "trustworthy source of information." On our part, we think that any employee of the Government who would clandestinely give out such a mendacious statement and so willfully mislead a Member of Congress should be summarily dismissed, and we feel justified in requesting, through you, that Mr. DAVIS give us the name of the employee referred to and a copy of the memorandum furnished by the employee, so that the latter may be properly dealt with.

There seems to us to be only one possible alternative to this course on the part of Mr. DAVIS. It may well be that quite unintentionally he misinterpreted to the House the information that was given him by the employee, in which event we feel sure Mr. DAVIS will desire to make the correction himself on the floor.

Yours very sincerely,

MEYER LISSNER, Commissioner.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3515. An act for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to stimulate crop production in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1923, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

907. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Coal Commission, transmitting the first report of the United States Coal Commission (H. Doc. No. 533); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

908. A letter from the secretary of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

909. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting a statement of receipts and disbursements of money through his hands December 1, 1921, to December 1, 1922, and a statement of property in his charge December 1, 1922; to the Committee on Accounts.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3169. An act to equalize pensions of retired policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution to create a commission to investigate the needs of the office of the recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8084. A bill to vacate certain streets and alleys within the area known as the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia; and to authorize the extension and widening of Fourteenth Street from Montague Street to its southern terminus south of Dahlia Street, Nicholson Street from Thirteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, Colorado Avenue from Montague Street to Thirteenth Street, Concord Avenue from Sixteenth Street to its western terminus west of Eighth Street west, Thirteenth Street from Nicholson Street to Piney Branch Road, and Piney Branch Road from Thirteenth Street to Blair Road, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13777. A bill to modify the Osage fund restrictions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURRY: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 13631. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii,' approved April 30, 1900, as amended, to establish a Hawaiian homes commission, granting certain powers to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1921; with amendments (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 13556. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLE: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 13555. A bill to provide for the publication of the Code of the Laws of the United States, with an index, parallel reference tables, and an appendix thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DALLINGER: Committee on Elections No. 1. H. Rept. 1415. A report on the contested-election case of Dan Parillo v. Stanley H. Kunz. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 13150. A bill for the relief of Blattmann & Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9631. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of E. J. Reynolds; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 1502. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Owen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 288. An act for the relief of John T. Eaton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth McKeller; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 2262. An act for the relief of Franklin A. Swenson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 2346. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan (Rept. No. 1405). Laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, the Committee of the Whole House was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12007) providing for the conveyance of certain land to the city of Boise, Idaho, and from the city of Boise, Idaho, to the United States, and said bill, together with the report thereon, was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed (H. Rept. No. 1382).

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 13805) to construct a post-office building and Federal courthouse at Spartanburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 13806) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 13807) granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware State Highway Department to construct a bridge across the Nanticoke River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIXLER: A bill (H. R. 13808) granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Venango County, their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERNERD: A bill (H. R. 13809) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Netherland, the Middle States, in 1624 by Walloons, French, and Belgian Huguenots under the Dutch West India Co.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 13810) to continue the improvement of the Mississippi River and for the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 422) permitting the entry free of duty of certain domestic animals which have crossed the boundary line into foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, favoring the passage of the Green resolution amending the Constitution of the United States making it possible to tax securities now exempted from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13811) granting a pension to Charles H. Crim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13812) to correct the military record of Richard Brannon and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 13813) granting a pension to Amanda Wishard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13814) granting a pension to Charles H. Ritter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 13815) granting an increase of pension to John Weidemann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13816) granting a pension to T. L. Ingram; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13817) granting a pension to Sarah G. Sperbeck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 13818) granting a pension to Lena Castor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13819) granting a pension to John C. Herin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 13820) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Scriven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON: A bill (H. R. 13821) granting an increase of pension to Temple Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13822) granting a pension to Jennie Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13823) granting an increase of pension to Amos E. Albritton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13824) granting a pension to Martin E. McMichael; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT (by request): A bill (H. R. 13825) for the relief of S. Silberstein & Son (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 484) authorizing appointment of additional clerk who shall be under supervision of the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6821. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of certain residents of Fresno County, Calif., urging support of joint resolution extending aid to people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6822. By Mr. BRIGGS: Letter and exhibits from G. W. Tilley, State fire marshal, Austin, Tex., advocating prohibiting the interstate shipment of inflammable films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6823. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition signed by 62 citizens of Bridgman, Mich., favoring aid to famine-stricken peoples of German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6824. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, New York City, urging favorable action on House bill 10213, a bill relating to the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6825. By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of several members of Zion Reformed Church, of Terre Haute, Ind., relative to House Joint Resolution 412; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 16, 1923.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast proven Thyself to be a very present help in time of trouble. And as we look out upon a distracted world we pray Thee for the wisdom necessary to cope with the difficulties, meet the problems, and deal with the strained situation that confronts nation after nation in these days. Our God, be our refuge, be our strength, and so help Thy servants before Thee and all others dealing with national or international affairs that results may be achieved which shall be for the good of humanity and Thy great glory. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE.
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1923.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MOSES thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, January 9, 1923, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following communications:

A communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, reporting, in response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, that the commission does not maintain any passenger automobiles or garages; that it does, however, maintain and use a Dodge truck for mail-carrying purposes, which is kept in one of the War Department garages at the rate of \$10 per month;

A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, information relative to the number and cost of maintenance of motor vehicles in use by the General Accounting Office; and

A communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, information relative to the number and cost of maintenance of motor vehicles in use by that institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to these reports from the various departments and divisions, I wonder if we can not have them placed all together and kept on the table, so that they may be considered together; or do they, under the rule, have to be referred as they come in?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They lie upon the table until disposed of by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that course be pursued, and that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McKellar	Simmons
Borah	Harrell	McKinley	Smoot
Brookhart	Harris	McLean	Spencer
Calder	Harrison	McNary	Stanfield
Cameron	Heflin	Moses	Sterling
Capper	Johnson	Nelson	Sutherland
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Culberson	Kellogg	Nicholson	Underwood
Curtis	Keyes	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	King	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Ladd	Oddie	Warren
Fletcher	La Follette	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Williams
George	Lodge	Robinson	Willis

Mr. WILLIS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. POMERENE] on account of illness. I desire that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] are engaged in a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FLETCHER. My colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Major William E. Army Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Porto Rico, favoring the passage of legislation to carry out the provisions of the national defense act so as to maintain the strength of the national defense against all possible enemies, either foreign or domestic, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS. I present resolutions adopted by the directors of the Steubenville (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce on December 18, 1922, relative to immigration questions, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Immigration and printed in the Record.